

DHCD WORKGROUP THREE (WG3) MEETING 2015 CODE CHANGE CYCLE

**MAY 10, 2016, 9:30 A.M.
VIRGINIA HOUSING CENTER**

Welcome and overview of cdpVA by Richard Potts.

C-113.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Bill Einloth

Einloth_engle@hotmail.com

113.3 Minimum Inspections: The following minimum inspections shall be conducted by the building official when applicable to the construction or permit: add inspection of non-vented crawl space to ensure compliance with IRC

Reason: A properly installed conditioned/encapsulation of a non-vented crawl space is critical to ensure homeowners do not become ill. The vapor barrier slows or prevents the evaporation of ground moisture into the crawl space which causes mold and other bacteria have to grow.

Comments:

Bill Einloth stated this was personal, he and his wife bought a modular home approximately a year and a half ago and the builder stated he would give a conditioned crawlspace. They moved into the home and there was no conditioned crawlspace nor insulation. He had to spend lots of money and time to fix the crawlspace. In one year he had mold growing on his windows.

Richard Bartell – Who was ultimately responsible?

Bill Einloth – I took my case to the Better Business Bureau, Office of the Attorney General, DHCD, a lawyer, and the building official. The building official said it was a minimum inspection.

Richard Bartell – Did you go through the appeals process? What did your permit say?

Bill Einloth – No, it was too late.

Richard Bartell – Was the permit for a conditioned crawlspace or ventless crawl.

Bill Einloth – neither, the buyers' agreement stated it would be a conditioned crawlspace.

Greg Revels – If it was part of the permit, we would inspect it.

Richard Bartell – If it is not part of the permit, the building official wouldn't know. I'm not trying to discount your problem, I'm just trying to look at the larger picture.

Richard Potts – So your goal is to create a mandatory inspection so that the crawlspace, regardless what is on the permit, is inspected to make sure everything is up to code or up to whatever is permitted.

Richard Potts - Anyone support this proposal? Workgroup 1 stated disapproval for this proposal.

Recommend consensus for disapproval, however, this will still move through the process. Language unnecessary.

Sean Farrell – When was your Certificate of Occupancy issued?

Bill Einloth – September 29, 2014.

Seam Farrell – You are still within the statutes of limitation. You still have the ability to get this corrected.

Emory Rodgers – I think the disapproval from the building officials is they believe the language is fine as is.

C-113.4.1 cdpVa-15 Proponent Campbell Gilmour
Campbell.Gilmour@comcast.net

113.4.1 Testing of Radon Systems.

Reason: Intent: To ensure mandatory radon mitigation systems are tested for effectiveness to certify the safety of the public.

Comments:

Skip Harper – Just to give you an overview, the Gilmour's bought a home in Rockingham County and had a conditioned crawlspace, they had a radon system installed and had it tested when they moved in and the radon levels were up over 40-45. They had a conditioned crawlspace, they closed off the path back into the home, which is now a violation of the conditioned crawlspace. they added a fan to the radon system to exhaust out of that space their radon levels dropped down to 5.

This is a citizen proposing to add requirements to test the systems when they are installed. so we have crafted the language putting it over in Chapter 1 of the USBC.

Their concern was for future homeowners.

Walter Lucas – I have radon systems being installed in homes in my jurisdiction but my jurisdiction has not required it. I believe the language should state when the radon system is installed not given the option if the jurisdiction adopts the enforcement of it.

Skip Harper – the language reads when Section R324.1 of the state amendments to the IRC is applicable.

Vernon Hodge – The way they have it written it only applies to those localities that are enforcing the radon, we weren't sure which way the proponent wanted this to apply to systems that were voluntarily installed or only where the systems were enforced. They chose to do it only where it is enforced because that is the least restrictive way to put this in.

Ron Clements – I am in strong opposition to requiring a need to make someone do something for a system that I do not enforce. If you are going to put something in like this, it should be put in the appendix.

John Ainslie – I believe the builders on the back row agree with everything Ron said.

Richard Potts – Anyone in support of this? Maybe it could work, but not so much.

Tylor Craddock – The builders on the front row agree with the builders on the back row.

Bill Einloth – This does go back to the crawlspace issue.

Richard Bartell – For a prescriptive requirement, the code is strictly for a passive radon system. That is the only one that is adopted by the localities. There are no limits in the code that shows what is an acceptable level of radon. We have no mechanism for testing because we don't know what the minimum level is. What we can do is apply the prescriptive requirement to the code to the passive radon removal system and nothing more. This is what the code allows us to do. If you want to expand the actual coverage of the code, we would have to expand far greater than what it is currently. We are not scientists we are building inspectors.

Vernon Hodge – We do want to mention in trying to help get this proponent's proposal in, one thing we realized is that we thought, I thought, that radon mitigation was for basements and not crawlspaces. In Section R324.1 we send you to the appendix and we say for vented crawlspaces you don't have to do it only for basements, but if it is a condition crawl then the radon still applies. The problem is because you can't harmonize the appendix provisions with the conditional crawlspace provisions. The conditional crawlspace requires the opening of the house into the crawlspace. You are just giving a place for the

radon to move up. Skip Harper contacted VBCOA and they are reviewing this. We may get a proposal from them.

Emory Rodgers – Can you let Mr. Gilmour know about this?

Consensus for disapproval May work into appendix

CR202 cdpVA-15 Proponent: Charles Bajnai, representing Chesterfield County for Thomas Stanton (timbertrails.tv@gmail.com)
bajnaic@chesterfield.gov

Section Chapter 2: Definitions Tiny house.

A dwelling unit on a permanent foundation that is 399 square feet or less.

Reason: The current trend is for a return to living in smaller structures, and commonalities for Tiny Houses imply the application of best practices for small space design that do not necessarily conflict with existing standards for general health and safety.

Comments:

Charles Bajnai – worked with Thom Stanton for overview of definitions and exceptions. He wants to get a proposal in the code that allows it.

Richard Bartell – My concern about this is I built a tiny house for a weekend getaway. I don't know why we have specific rules.

Charles Bajnai - This guy is taking all of this on his back and doesn't even own one. What don't you like about this, plumbing, electrical, etc.

Tyler Craddock – Zoning issue rather than a code issue. How many exceptions do you need?

Charlie Grove – I agree this is a planning and zoning issue and if this gets into the code it should be a definition of sorts with an exemption from the USBC.

Thom Stanton just walked in and reviewed Tiny Homes. We need to make smaller concessions to accommodate smaller spaces.

Emory Rodgers – You need to look at your friends in San Francisco, CA and Seattle, WA, they have amended their codes to deal with some of this. This code change in IRC would be a site built home. Over the 399 sq. ft. home, HUD is back in the picture and it will be a HUD home and needs a label. If it is built in a plant it is a Manufactured Home. Others are RV's.

Thom Stanton – Sonoma, CA the challenge to get around the IRC goes to ANSI. This may not be a viable answer in VA.

Charlie Grove – Tiny Houses lowers standard benchmark for safety. I don't think it should be in the codes.

Glenn Dean – I'm concerned about SFMO rescues in tiny houses . There is no room for firefighters.

Richard Bartell – don't base codes on building trends.

Mike Toalson Any proposals come through ICC? Any modification systems.

Thom Stanton – People are taking garden sheds and making them into tiny houses. It is an industrialized building.

Richard Bartell – We are trying to get people from living in too small areas. I think what is missing from this is a technical explanation to why these exceptions should be granted.

Sean Farrell – So is this safe to assume that this is an attempt to open the door and if you are able to be successful here, that the next code cycle you would try to get exceptions for energy, insulation, plumbing, mechanical and electrical requirements?

Thom Stanton – I think your questions is asked well, the point of contention that I think is to big to fight today is that I think this might be a foot in the door for, Is the unfortunate you can't have it on a steel chassis build it and have it inspected elsewhere and have it brought into our county. We know this is a HUD issue. Are people

Steven L'Heureux, AIA – As an architect, if I have a client come to me and say I want to build a house, I would say, how big? If they say 400 sq. ft. I would get out my paper and pick up my code book and I would design a house that meets code to the acceptable standard and I know it can be done. I don't see why we need to get exceptions to what I know can be done for personal safety, health and welfare.

Richard Potts – Any comments for support of this proposal.

Move forward for consensus of disapproval.

CR-R302-1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Ron Clements, representing Chesterfield County

clementsro@chesterfield.gov

2012 Virginia Residential Code
R302.1 Exterior walls.

Reason: It has become a routine process to issue building code modifications on a sub-division wide basis to allow dwellings on adjacent lots to be constructed without the fire-resistance rating required by R302 because the local zoning ordinance prohibits dwelling from being closer than 10 feet from each other. The zoning ordinance established set-backs effectively satisfy the intent of the code. Since these pertinent ordinances, per the USBC, are legally established limits enforced by the locality, it is reasonable to accept them as a code enforcement option to meet the intent of R302.

Comments:

Richard Potts – This was heard in Workgroup 1 with a consensus for approval.

Ron Clements – Basically there are a number of subdivisions where they set-up through pertinent laws of ordinances subdivision which prohibits dwelling from being closer than 10 feet apart. For example, on one side of the property line, you may be less than 5 feet apart and on the other side of the property line must be greater than 10 feet. It is typical house, driveway, and house. Basically you have a zoning ordinance which will never allow two houses to be closer than 10 feet from each other. The intent is to add an exception to acknowledge that and not require the fire resistance rating. This is a green code change, because we are going to save a pile of paper

Richard Potts **Consensus for approval.**

CR-R311.2.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Charles Bajnai, representing Chesterfield County.

bajnaic@chesterfield.gov

2012 Virginia Residential Code
R311.2.1 Interior passage.

Reason: I applaud the intention and wisdom of the original proponents of this section. The initial knee jerk reaction by contractors was quickly replaced with acceptance and an advertising promotion for aging in place. But the verbiage (and punctuation) in R311.2.1 has created interpretation nightmares. This proposal has tried to clarify the requirements without expanding significantly the original intent.

Comments:

Interior passage.

Chuck Bajnai – the concept was good 3 years ago and it was just impossible as a plan reviewer to interpret. I just wanted to get something on paper, if you want to modify, that's good. I saw another proposal that is trying to make this applicable

to split level houses. I thought this might be a reach. I was just trying to simplify the language.

Richard Potts – What specifically did you feel wasn't working for you?

Chuck Bajnai – First of all, the first sentence of interior passage says when you have a door and then you have these two things and then you have a bedroom. It doesn't say if I have a living room and a kitchen. Is the bedroom also applicable? Or the independent requirements, let's say I have no kitchen on the entry, but I have a bedroom or if it doesn't have a kitchen is it automatically thrown out? The language is really vague.

Richard Bartell – I don't think the language is vague, it is purposeful. Only if you meet these requirements. Where

Emory Rodgers – Ron did a great code change but hasn't submitted it yet.

Chuck Bajnai – Let's look at the first sentence. Where a dwelling end unit has both a kitchen and a living room or entertainment area on the same level as the egress door, an interior passage shall be provided from such door to the kitchen and living room or entertainment area into at least one bedroom and a bathroom. If I don't have a living room or I don't have a kitchen the bedroom doesn't make any sense. The bedroom is automatically out.

Richard Bartell – You have to have the kitchen and the entertainment area in order to qualify the bedroom or a full bath.

John Ainslie – I appreciate what you are trying to do. There is some confusion. One thing I understand is that to me if I have this bathroom that needs to meet this requirement and the bathroom has a toilet room in it, its common sense to me without being written that the toilet room also meet the requirement. However, the current code doesn't state this. A reasonable accommodation needs to be explained.

Chuck Bajnai – That is what I wrote in the Reason statement. The requirement to make "reasonable accommodation" should not be dismissed as too vague, subjective and unenforceable.

Emory Rodgers – What was mentioned in the code cycle three years ago was in regards to a split level with 3 steps up and 3 steps down. We hadn't thought about this, Ron fixed it but hasn't submitted it.

Ron Clements – I had forgotten about this code change. Remind me.

Steven L'Heureaux – In essence we are talking about an accessible route into spaces. The commercial code speaks to it pretty plain. Maybe if this language is too obscure, we could use language from the commercial code that speaks to this.

Richard Bartell – When we had discussions about this, one of the main fears was that this was going to lead to a mandate for accessibility in single family dwellings. This was not the goal. The goal at the discussion was for usability and stay in place in your home. I think it was pretty clear during the discussions you had to have all of the three components before you did anything. I think to not include the water closet is pretty silly.

Greg Revel – I think what Chuck is trying to say is the language in the code is horrible. It is very poorly written.

Mike Toalson – This was a huge compromise designed to make the first step into making a home with these requirements on the egress level accessible. Why did you initiate the double doors?

Pending collaboration the proponent and interested parties will sit down and discuss: Ron Clements, Chuck Bajnai, Tyler Craddock, Steve Cook, Steven L'Heureux, Mike Toalson, and John Catlett.

Pending Collaboration

CR-R311.8.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Charles Bajnai
bajnaic@chesterfield.gov

2012 Virginia Residential Code
R311.8.1 Width.

Reason: We have requirement for stair width, but not ramp width. We have always inferred the stair width of 36" would be the same for ramps. This code proposal removes the "interpretation" and specifies that ramps have to be at least 36" wide.

Comments:

Width of ramps

Chuck Bajnai – I took this to Louisville at ICC and it got shot down. There is nothing in the code that states the width of a ramp. The committee turned me down because it was not ANSI compliant. It is not required in the IRC. In the past it was dictated by the width of the stair. ANSI compliant is it is 36" on the inside of the handrails.

John Catlett - no requirement in codes

Richard Bartell – In 30 years, I have never known this to be an issue.

Walter Lucas – up to builder

Steven L’Heureux – What if the ramp was inside the house, would we consider this to be a corridor?

Richard Bartell – Yes, and all of those rules would apply.

Richard Potts - **Consensus for disapproval.**

CR-R408.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent Ken Latham
ken@GoSdd.com

2012 Virginia Residential Code
R408.2 Openings for under-floor ventilation.

Reason: This intent of this change has been written to address the non-uniform code enforcement of the USBC 2012/IRC 2012 Section R408.2 exception shown below. In the IRC 2003 the State Building Code Technical Review Board concluded in Code Interpretation No. 1/2003 that foundation vents were no required to be placed within 3 feet of each corner. Question: Does Exception No. 2 provide an exception to the general requirement that one ventilation opening shall be within three feet of each corner? Answer: Yes, provided the openings are placed so as to provide cross-ventilation. The need for this change is to help clarify the code for the building officials allowing all localities to uniformly enforce the code provisions. This will remove the subjective interpretation of this section.

Comments:
Openings for underfloor ventilation

No discussion

Vernon Hodge – the language got changed at the national level, however, there are still some building officials that are requiring the ventilation openings to be within three feet of each corner. Just need to say that there must be cross ventilation.

Consensus Non consensus, no discussion

Sean Farrell - language not necessary

CR-R507.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Charles Bajnai representing Chesterfield County.

2015 International Residential Code
R507.1 Decks

Reason: This proposal was approved in Louisville last week. It is intended to provide prescriptive language and fill in the missing parts of R507 for the weekend warrior and yet not stifle the creativity of custom deck builders. The Deck Code Coalition will be submitting public comments in Kansas City for the remaining items that were not approved in Louisville, namely freestanding decks, deck beams and guards. If these public comments get passed, I will be submitting last minute changes for the Board to consider.

Comments:

Chuck Bajnai – I have been chairman of the Deck Code Coalition, we have been meeting for 3 ½ years with 40 members. We drafted 18 code changes and 14 proposals were passed so far. What I have in this compiled document, is everything that has been passed. This will go into the 2018 IRC unless there is public comment against it. The controversial things have been left out such as dealing with guards, free standing decks and cross bracing. We are working with ASC 7 group and ICCES on guards.

Non consensus move forward

Emory Rodgers – I wouldn't support this. I can't believe we need 18 pages of words and diagrams for decks in VA. 3 pages is plenty.

Mike Toalson – I think every time, when ICC gets in the next code cycle, people start trying to pull 2018 codes into VA codes. I'm not sure, let them go ahead and do what they want to up there and have us move forward what we have to work with. Stop trying to bring their stuff some at which have been rejected down to us.

Chuck Bajnai – Every week someone sends me 2-3 deck failures around the world and some have 2-5 million dollars in legal fees. We are just trying to make decks safer.

Sean Farrell – There are advantages and disadvantages of the national codes. They may work and may not work.

John Catlett I am not aware of deck failures being a major issue. I believe this is a maintenance issue. Let's see where this goes on the national code scale.

Richard Bartell – I am not aware of a deck failure Hanover in the last 29 years of a code compliant deck. I am aware of a handful of deck failures where they were not code compliant decks. I think we are trying to fix a problem that doesn't exist.

John Catlett – I believe lag bolts have corrected some of the problems.

Chuck Bajnai – SC went to DCA-6 ledgered decks. In SC you cannot build free standing decks. Home Depot has a 4-part series video for homeowners to use to build their decks. 70% of decks are built by homeowners on a Saturday afternoon with a case of beer. 30% of decks are built by professional deck builders. In a 3 minute segment there were 5 deck violations. It took four months with contacts to lawyers to get this Home Depot video removed.

Richard Bartlett – the code is not a guide book, it doesn't tell you how to build a house

No support Consensus for disapproval

CR-P2602.3 cdpVA-15 Proponent Carl Dale

Carl.dale@scc.virginia.gov

2015 International Residential Code

2602.3 Tracer Wire

Reason: In February 2014, a home exploded in Stafford County Virginia. The explosion was caused by damage to a nonmetallic water service utility line (water lateral) that had not been installed with a tracer wire and had not been located prior to excavation. Local building inspectors are regularly on-site at or near the time of installation of these water laterals during their construction. The building inspectors' ability to inspect/enforce this proposed requirement will minimize the chances of similar circumstances such as the Stafford explosion from occurring again by ensuring all non-metallic water laterals have tracer wires to facilitate excavators locating the water lateral for safe excavation around the water lateral.

Comments:

Tracer wire on plastic water pipes.

John Ainslie – same with sewer pipes

No more discussion, No consensus

CTP-603.3 cdpVa-15 Proponent Carl Dale

Carl.dale@scc.virginia.gov

2015 International Plumbing Code

603.3 Tracer Wire

Reason: same as above

Vernon Hodge – This tracer wire deals with water pipe. In the previous codes, we dealt with sewer pipes. They are asking for a provision for the plastic sewer pipe.

Charlie Gerber – The only comment I have to make is the residential code proposal both for sewer and waterline was more for the purpose, in my understanding, for the homeowner to have on record for contractors when digging was involved. I have had many questions from homeowners asking about a record of their sewer line and waterlines. No record, no drawings associated with it so the tracer line was and still is an alternative to that. The tracer line is only good to a particular depth and once you go beyond that depth its not technical. On commercial job sites you have detailed drawings which are pretty accurate as far as the location of water and sewer. I don't have a problem with it being in the plumbing code, IPC, but its not going to be effective at all for these reasons.

Emory Rodgers – As they note in their reason statement, it appears that the water authority delivers the water to commercial or residential and it sounds like there is a solution to the problem already in existence. Maybe they can talk with local water authorities.

Non Consensus

CT-G310.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Bob Torbin

Bob.torbin@omegaflex.net

2015 International Fuel Gas Code
Pipe and tubing

Reason: The use of a CSST product with a protective, arc resistant jacket is an equivalent method of protection against electrical arcing damage caused by high voltage transient events such as lightning strikes. The protective jacket is designed to locally absorb and dissipate the arcing energy or conduct it away. The 2018 IFGC will include arc resistant CSST without the need for additional bonding when that language is extracted from the 2018 NFPA 54. We are asking that Virginia recognize those changes with the adoption of the 2015 IFGC. States currently permitting black jacket CSST without additional bonding per Section 7.13.2 are: Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Connecticut, Colorado, Montana, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Georgia, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Indiana, Michigan, Oregon and Maryland.

Comments:

David Edler – spoke on behalf of Bob Torbin. I am here to speak on support of his proposal. We thought with the code changes going on, we thought it would be a good time to come down and share some information to help you make your decision. Right now there is a requirement in the International Fuel Gas Code for bonding. Arc resistant jackets have been for sale by Omegaflex since 2004 as a

means to deal with indirect lightning strikes and arcing damage. He continued his overview on this proposal.

Bryan Holland, NEMA Codes and Standards – Where LC1 is referenced it is probably a good idea to add LC1/CSA 6.26 since this is going to be a standard.

Richard Bartell – Why do we want to move on this?

David Edler – this was a good way to get the ball rolling

Charlie Gerber – I am familiar with another brand. I have concerns with this.

Vernon Hodge – There is a link for the documentation Mr. Edler has been discussing.

Richard Bartlett I say we hold the questions.

Consensus Pending to the next workgroup meeting

CT-S305.2.10 cdpVa-15 Proponent Michael Redifer
mredifer@nvva.gov

2015 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code
305.2.10 Barrier setbacks

Reason: Establishing a setback from lot lines equal to the clear zone dimension of 36 inches (305.2.9) will ensure future activity by adjacent property owner will not require relocation of the barrier in order to maintain the established level of safety.

Comments:

Richard Bartlett What is the purpose of 36 inches?

Vernon Hodge – If you have a fence that is on the lot line that 2 property owners are trying to share for their pools. That pools are on both sides. He wants to make sure that the fences are well inside the lot line so this never occurs.

Ron Clements – If barrier was removed it would be a violation of the maintenance code so we could still cite them.

No support, Consensus Disapproval

CE-R402.1.1 cdpVA-15 Proponent Bruce Cornwall
bcornwall@culpepercounty.gov

2012 Virginia Energy Conservation Code
Insulation and fenestration requirements by component

Reason: R-49 has been the standard for ceiling insulation in our area in the national code for 4 years. Studies show that the added insulation will more than pay for itself in the life of the home. From R-38 to R-49.

Comments:

Bruce Cornwall – This is attempting to add to the insulation in the ceiling to get it up to the national level. Changing the ceiling from R-38 to R-49. A minimal cost compared to the cost of the house. There is no additional work for the builder other than putting more insulation in the home. This doesn't require any different framing.

Mike Toalson – we disapproved this before. Benefit vs cost is too much. We will continue to object to this.

Andrew Grigsby - I fully support this. This has been a part of the national model code since 2012. National labs consider this cost effective. A few hundred bucks for most homes. A few extra dollars now to do it now versus later it would cost a lot more. This is just common sense.
Common sense

Mike Toalson – I wasn't aware of this being on the agenda. If I had known, I would have been better prepared.

Chuck Bajnai – Is this to to change VA code not national code.

Vernon Hodge - correct

Non consensus, Move forward

Emory Rodgers - Keep on table and come back at next workgroup meeting on August 3

Mike Toalson - HBAV would be opposed to this at this point.

CE-R403.2.2 cdpVA-15 Proponent Andrew Grigsby
Andrew@leap-va.org

2012 Virginia Energy Conservation Code
Sealing (Mandatory)
Visual inspection option

Reason: There is no substitute for a pressure test of the ductwork. Any person who actually has tested ductwork knows that, unless every inch of the entire duct

system is readily visible, then only a mechanical test would have a hope of finding all of the leaks.

Comments:

Andrew Grigsby – I provide the mechanical tests that gives you the numbers for duct work. I don't see how the code can say there is a number such as 6% leakage and the code official has ultimate authority ensuring that the letter of the code is met. If there is a reasonable way to get that number of the leakage, why doesn't the code official not get that number? The cost effective reasonable way used all over the country which has been a part of the national codes since 2012 makes absolutely no sense not to have that mechanical test.

Walter Lucas – That is why the 2012 code put in the whole house ventilation requirement with a visual inspection to ensure the 5 air exchanges per hour.

Andrew Grigsby – This proposal is about eliminate the visual inspection to ducts.

Walter Lucas – There is only one person in Roanoke and one person in Greensboro that can perform this test.

Andrew Grigsby – the low income weatherization group they are all getting this work done. They are getting ductwork testing. There are certified inspectors all over the state.

Richard Bartell – You need to give us some reasons why we need to change not just tell us we are doing a bad job? What is the actual benefit for the citizens of our communities so we can convince our politicians who pay the bills?

Charlie Gerber - What difference does 6% matter to you if the house doesn't have enough air changes you have to poke a hole on the outside of it and condition that air? You are wasting energy to save energy.

Andrew Grigsby – I think the confusion between whole house leakage and duct leakage in this room demonstrates the confusion in the industry about the basic building science.

Mike Toalson – This proposal was not on the agenda and we didn't have time to prepare for it. The reason this proposal was rejected last time was two significant reasons, (1) was we did a survey among builders which we did not have the opportunity to do this year, There is a significant lack of professionals that do this kind of testing in many parts of the state (2) People in the industry including you agree that if you had a rectangle room where there are plenty of professionals it would be fine, but we don't. We chose not to adopt this requirement. Right now, we would seek Non Consensus for this.

Linda Baskerville Arlington County Energy Inspections and Plan Review – We go out and visually inspect the ducts, visually inspecting the ducts does not get you to 5 changes per hour because we will do the visual inspection and testers come along behind us that do mechanical testing, we fail. It takes a lot of work to find the leaks and fix them. Otherwise if you don't stick with that, you are losing energy right out of the ducts.

Vernon Hodge - **Pending for another meeting.**

Significant issues for Workgroup 3

ICC comes out with significant changes and Cindy had us go out and these are the ones we came up with.

R302.13 Fire Protection of Floors – We deleted this in 2012 but it was last minute and we didn't have time for people to collaborate on it. Vernon reviewed the underfloor protection provision.

John Ainslie I remember discussions on this one with many objections.

We are just discussing these. No proposals just topics for discussion. This stays as is. When the new model code comes out, we take a look at our current code and figure out how our existing amendments are going to move into the new code. We have a lot of correlation issues we have to do. We put this out there for people to go through and make sure we haven't forgotten anything.

Section M1506 Exhaust Ducts and Exhaust Openings - Whole House Ventilation

Mike Toalson – How are the building officials administering this?

Vernon - reviewed the history from last code cycle. This is an energy conservation issue, we want to have healthy air changers.

Charlie Gerber - This should go away.

Chuck Bajnai – I support Charlie Gerber.

John Ainslie – I would vote with Charlie Gerber.

Emory Rodgers – Check with Cindy and re-send info we sent out last July to all building officials.

R301.2.1.1.1 Sunrooms

Apply with standards instead of IRC

Vernon Hodge reviewed

Chuck Bajnai – I believe this is straight forward.

R311.1 Means of Egress

Vernon Hodge reviewed

Wall Bracing emails and R602.10.9 Braced wall panel support.

Vernon Hodge stated we would review this and we will place back in. We will probably get a proposal for the next meeting.

Chuck Bajnai - I move to accept.

Emory IRC 1601 I suggest you place on the agenda for August 3.

John Ainslie - wrote to me in 2014 regarding a return in every bedroom. No building official has asked about this.

Workgroup 3 meeting was adjourned.